The Vedic "Five Tribes"
Author(s): D. D. Kosambi
Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 87, No. 1 (Jan. - Mar., 1967), pp. 33-39
Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/596592
Accessed: 12/06/2014 13:46

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 91.229.229.96 on Thu, 12 Jun 2014 13:46:44 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

THE VEDIC "FIVE TRIBES"*

D. D. KOSAMBI
POONA

1. THE ṚGVEDA refers several times[1] to the "Five Tribes" (as *janāḥ* in Rv. 3.37.9; 3.59.8; 7.11.4; 8.32.22; 9.65.23; 9.92.3; 10.45.6; 10.53.4-5 and *jātāḥ* in 6.61.12). The "Five Humans" (*mānuṣāḥ*) occur in RV. 8.9.2, "Five Nations" (*kṛṣṭayaḥ*) in RV. 3.2.10; 3.53.16 and "Five Mobile Peoples" (*carṣaṇyaḥ*) are cited in RV. 5.86.2; 7.15.2; 9.101.9. The last two designations may be traced to the same root *kṛṣ*, to haul or drag, which is closely associated with ploughing in later Sanskrit. The Five are nowhere explicitly named in any early source. However, a set of five tribal names occurs in just one place, RV. 1.108.8: Yadu, Turvaśa, Anu, Druhyu, Pūru. Each of these is mentioned separately in other Ṛgvedic hymns. The first four come together again in RV. 8.10.5, which led to the conjecture that the seer belonged to the fifth, the Pūrus. Turvaśa is generally found with Yadu; Anu and Druhyu are comparatively rare. The Pūrus are perhaps the most favoured single Ṛgvedic people though occasionally cursed by a hostile seer like Vasiṣṭha in the famous Ten-Kings hymn RV. 7.18. In that *sūkta*, all Five are among the many enemies over whom King Sudās prevailed, except the Yadus who might perhaps be concealed under the title Yakṣu (which seems an unlikely conjecture to me).

Western scholars from Roth onwards[2] generally agree that the various citations *jana, jāta, mānuṣa, carṣaṇī, kṛṣṭi* should be equated in this particular context. The Five are then taken precisely as Yadu, Turvaśa, Anu, Druhyu, Pūru. No other pentad anywhere else in the Vedas can possibly refer to human groups. This quite reasonable identification is flatly contradicted by the interpretations which Indian commentators have given from the earliest times.

Sāyaṇa in his *bhāṣya* to the *Ṛgveda* takes the Five to mean the four class-castes (*varṇa*) with the autochthonous savages (*niṣāda*) as the fifth. This amounts to all Indian humanity and even all mankind in a brahmin's reckoning. The particular interpretation seems to have originated with Aupamanyava, according to Yāska's *Nirukta* 3.8. On Ṛgveda 9.66.20, however, Sāyaṇa offers two other alternatives besides his favorite equivalence. The Five are either the Gandharvas, Fathers (*pitaraḥ*), Gods (*devāḥ*), Asuras and demons (*rakṣāṃsi*); or Gods and Men, Gandharvas and Apsarasas, Snakes, Fathers. The latter classification could presumably be reduced to five categories by taking Gandharva and Apsaras as the male and female of a single species; neither Sāyaṇa nor his source (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 3.31) bothers about such arithmetic trifles. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* mentions the Five in 13.5.4.14 without details or ethnic implications, as does the *Aitareya* in 8.23. Sāyaṇa preserves the ambiguity when commenting upon RV. 6.51.11; 6.61.12. On RV. 1.176.3, he interprets the Five as the four castes plus *niṣādas*, with yet another alternative: Gods, Men, Fathers, Beasts and Birds. Yet the comment on RV. 10.45.6 states unequivocally: *pañca janāḥ = mānuṣāḥ* as on 7.15.2: *pañca carṣaṇīḥ = pañca janān, manuṣyān*. Only a veteran Indian *paṇḍita*, serenely conscious of his mastery of the sacred books, could contradict himself so often with such perfect aplomb.

Sāyaṇa and the Indian traditionalists nowhere give the Five as specific tribes, let alone the particular Five enumerated above. Even on RV. 1.108.8, each of the Five Tribes named is equated in the comment to a separate type or character of human being, but not taken as the proper noun designating an ethnic group which had actually borne that name.

---

* It is my sad duty to report that Professor Kosambi died on June 29, 1966—[EDITOR].

[1] The general references will be found in A. A. Macdonell and A. B. Keith's *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*; 2 vol. (London, 1912). The analysis by A. Ludwig in the third volume of *Der Rigveda* (Prag 1878) has also been of great use. For the Mahabharata, the critical text, still incomplete, of the Poona edition (Bhandarkar O. R. Institute) has been used; in this, some of the references given in Sörensen's *Index* (London 1904) drop out of the main text.

[2] A. Zimmer: *Altindisches Leben, die Kultur der Vedischen Arier nach den Saṃhita dargestellt* (Berlin, 1879) pp. 119-125 gives a comprehensive discussion.

This content downloaded from 91.229.229.96 on Thu, 12 Jun 2014 13:46:44 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

2. The Indian and Western views are not so completely irreconcilable as they appear at first sight. It has already been noted in passing that Sāyaṇa's main interpretation makes the Five virtually synonymous with all mankind. The alternatives he derived from older commentators seem equivalent to 'all moving creation' in the context. Modern scholars have also remarked that *pañca janāḥ* is in fact used with some such universal connotation by many of the original seers. Indra is "of the Five tribes" (*pāñcajanya*: RV. 5.32.11; 9.66.20 &c), though the Boghaz-Koï texts show that even Aryans whose tribal names do not appear in the Vedas also worshipped Indra. Similarly, *mānava, mānuṣa* literally mean 'descendant of Manu,' an Aryan progenitor; the meaning was later extended to cover all humanity, though not all creatures. For the last, the brahmins had to discover Kaśyapa as father of all creation (*prajāpati*) with the indispensable cooperation of Aditi and other goddesses.

Geldner's note on RV. 9.101.9 brings out the modern critical view fairly well:[3] "Die fünf Völker umspannen den geographischen Horizont des Dichters, vgl. 7.15.2. Für *pañca* steht allgemein *viśvāḥ* 1.86.5; 4.7.4; 5.23.1." The point may be argued, for people in the primitive tribal stage do not think of men and women outside the tribe as really human. Shifting the seer's mental horizon from the geographical to the ethnic world and allowing for the gradual changes of viewpoint would be better. As Zimmer (*loc. cit.* p. 125) put it: "Solche Redeweisen werden leicht formelhaft, werden beibehalten aus Ehrfurcht gegen das Hergebrachte, auch wenn die Verhältnisse nicht mehr stimmen . . . So kann wirklich in jüngeren Liedern in den Ausdruck öfters eine Bezeichnung der Menschen überhaupt liegen; dies beweist jedoch nichts für den ursprünglichen Sinn desselben."

If one could stop here, the whole discussion reduces to a triviality. The real difficulty lies in explaining the historical process of change, of the loss of specific tribal meaning when the Five are actually named in a Ṛgvedic hymn. For Sāyaṇa, this difficulty did not exist, for the simple reason that history meant nothing to him. The Ṛgveda was eternal and immutable, though his own glosses show how far the course of historical change had brought him from the original meaning. Not only had the Five Tribes vanished long before Sāyaṇa but the initial significance of the Veda had passed away just as completely. The learned pundits assembled to help Sāyaṇa with his great task might recite the Soma book (RV. 9) in its entirety from memory without error in so much as a single tone accent; none of them even knew what the original *soma* plant was. Any suggestion that they sacrifice cattle publicly in honour of Agni or Indra would have caused the utmost consternation and appeared sacrilegious. Blood sacrifices did continue among far lower strata of the population, as they do to this day—without benefit of Brahminism, or of the Veda. The vedic scholars were themselves steeped to the marrow in Upaniṣad-vedānta philosophy and worshipped gods not known to the Vedas.

3. The mechanism of historical change suggested by modern scholars in the case of the Five not only creaks but falls apart when one tries to make it work. Ludwig (*loc. cit.* p. 125) could not decide how the Kurus came to rule instead of the Pūrus, or even whether the two were the same with a trifling change of name. Macdonell and Keith (2.12) quote this with approval as supported by Oldenberg's conjecture: that the 'sudden disappearance' of the Pūrus is accounted for by their having "become part of the great Kuru people, just as Turvaśa and Krivi disappear from their being merged into the Pañcāla nation."

There is still wilder suggestion that the Five turned into the Pañcālas. Yet the historical climax of the Pūrus is not in doubt. They put into the field the largest single Indian army to oppose Alexander. The king's name was Πῶρος, also the name of a rebellious nephew who headed a fraction of the tribe. Throughout the Ṛgveda, the tribal chief is mentioned by the tribal name, much in the manner of Scottish clan-chiefs, when referred to by persons not members of his clan. It follows that the Pūrus were still the greatest single 'nation' of the west Panjāb, had changed neither their name nor their location and surely not merged into the "great Kuru people," at least till 327-6 B. C. The battle against Alexander wiped out the flower of their manhood, but the defeated king Poros was given a satrapy in the Panjāb by the conqueror. About five years later came the

[3] K. F. Geldner: *Der Rigveda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsch ubersetzt und mit ein laufenden Kommentar versehen* (*Harvard Oriental Series*, vols. 33-35; Cambridge, Mass., 1951), with an index and notes edited by J. Nobel, vol. 36 of the *HOS* (1957).

This content downloaded from 91.229.229.96 on Thu, 12 Jun 2014 13:46:44 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

irresistible flood from the east. An immense Magadhan army under Candragupta Maurya swept over the Panjāb, across the Indus and deep into Afghanistan. The conquered regions were held by the Mauryans for over a century, after which a succession of Greek, Śaka, Kuṣāṇa and other invaders pushed in again from the west. There is no reason to believe that all Pūrus were killed off, but clearly the double military catastrophe between the years 327 and 317 B. C. (approximately) finished them as a tribe, nation, or politically important group.

Far from having absorbed the Pūrus, the "great Kuru people" were off the scene before Alexander. Their supposed greatness, due presumably to the impressive bulk of the *Mahābhārata* and to nothing else, had vanished still earlier. While the epic treats the Kurus and their Paṇḍu cousins as world-conquerors with a concept of universal monarchy which could not have jelled before Candragupta Maurya, the very theme of the work is the civil war which ended in total extermination of both sides. This war cannot be put after Alexander's invasion; nor do Greek accounts mention the Kurus. The epic itself tells us that a stillborn posthumous son of Abhimanyu was quickened into life by Kṛṣṇa's divine intervention. This was Parikṣit, installed upon the throne of Taxila, not of Delhi, for no apparent reason. It is again obvious that Parikṣit's line was extinct before Alexander's raid, for only a king Taxiles is mentioned without any other name as having welcomed and joined Alexander. The Upaniṣadic riddle: "What became of the Pārikṣitas" (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* 3.4.1) asked in the Madra region and the answer, that the Pārikṣitas went to the Elysian fields reserved for horse-sacrificers, both prove the extinction. The Taxilans of the 4th century B. C. belonged to the eastern division of the two Gandhāras, hence were not Kurus. A small Kuru tribal kingdom did exist in the Delhi-Meerut region down to the time of the Buddha, who uttered several discourses in Kuru land (*Dīgha-Nikāya* 15, 22 and *Majjhima-N.* 10, 75, 82, 106). It is difficult to imagine that it could have survived as late as 350 B. C., because Mahāpadma Nanda of Magadha is credited with the destruction of the last truly kṣatriya tribes.[4] All genealogies[5] of the Mbh-Purāṇa complex make the Kurus a branch of the Pūrus or, what is the same thing, the eponymous ancestor Kuru a descendant of Pūru. No merger is ever mentioned in the records.

4. The *Mahābhārata* refers to the Pūrus even apart from the genealogies. A Paurava king was defeated by Arjuna on the north-west frontier (Mbh. 2.24.15). Comparison of the adjoining tribal names in this passage with the parallel list of people offering gifts to Yudhiṣṭhira at the *rājasūya* coronation sacrifice makes it likely that Pauraka in Mbh. 2.48.13 should be emended to Paurava. A Paurava comes in the traditional list of "universal (*cakravartin*) emperors" as in Mbh. 1.61.28; and in Mbh. 2.8.8, 3.83.110, 3.92.17 and 12.160.73. No critical text is available for the thirteenth book, but Sörensen's index shows the name also in Mbh. 13.94.115 and 13.116.

Besides this fabulous and exemplary monarch, there is at least one other Paurava in the epic. He actually fought in the battle at Kurukṣetra, as a *mahārathi* on Duryodhana's side (Mbh. 5.14.4). Bhīṣma reckons him among the "great chariots" of the Kaurava army in 5.164.19, which presumably makes him the commander of a Paurava contingent. Arjuna killed Damana, heir-apparent to Paurava in Mbh. 6.57.20. In Mbh. 6.112.15-26, Paurava was carried off the field of battle by Jayatsena, seriously wounded in a desperate duel with Dhṛṣṭaketu of Cedi. Nevertheless, he appeared once more against Arjuna's heroic son Abhimanyu in Mbh. 7.13.44-58. The fight went against him and he was rescued in dire straits by

[4] F. E. Pargiter: *The Purāṇa Text of The Dynasties of The Kali Age*; (Oxford, 1913), pp. 23-25; 69. Mahāpadma could not have destroyed all the tribes mentioned in this passage. Buddhist and Purāṇa records agree that the Ikṣvākus proper in the main line ended with Sumitra of Mithilā, who died about the time of the Buddha's birth. The Maithilas and Kāśeyas had been absorbed by the Kosalans before that time and had no independent existence. However, the Kurus, the Pañcālas associated with them, and the Śūrasenas of Mathurā fit logically into the known time-table of Magadhan expansion. Pargiter's introductory note on p. 23 makes a poor guess: "The Kurus (who are probably the Kauravas)." Pauravas of the principal line flourished till 327 B. C. in west Panjāb. The Purāṇā writers were obviously easterners who knew something about the Kuru genealogy, with a bare outline of the tradition that the Kurus were an offshoot of the Pūru tribe. The Gandhāra, Madra, Śibi, Western Cedi and other powerful tribal kingdoms of the frontier were known to the *Mahābhārata*, Buddhist records and some to Greek accounts. The Purāṇas, which mention people like the trifling Vītihotras, ignore even these really important western Aryans.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 4-8; 65-66; Mbh. 1.89, and another version in 1.90.

This content downloaded from 91.229.229.96 on Thu, 12 Jun 2014 13:46:44 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Jayadratha. With stamina remarkable even for a Bhāratan chariot-fighter, he was among those who rescued Duryodhana a little later in the same engagement (Mbh. 7.36.6). There is some defect in the source material here, for a hitherto unnamed Paurava suddenly appears on the other side, fighting in Pāṇḍava ranks. Aśvatthaman shoots five consecutive shafts at Arjuna, Bhīmasena, the Cedi prince, the Paurava Vṛddhakṣatra and Sudarśana of the Mālavas. The fourth prince had his arms and head struck off in Mbh. 7.171.64 by Aśvathaman's arrows. This was too much even for a Paurava, for his death is confirmed by 7.172.9. The last reference calls him the Paurava *yuvarāja*. Mbh. 8.4.35 reports that it was Arjuna who killed Paurava of the myriad elephant-corps. There is some doubt about the reading of the name here, and even more in 9.23.25 which has the Paurava Jalasaṃdha on the death-roll, though 9.21.33 calls him the Kaurava Jalasaṃdha. The bards were a bit careless, our critical editors not critical enough in this case at least.

These references to Pūru and Paurava are less relevant to our problem of the Five than the *Mahābhārata* story of Yayāti. King Yayāti had five sons: Yadu and Turvasu by a brahmin wife, Devayānī; and Druhyu, Anu, Pūru (or Puru) by the clandestine kṣatriya wife Śarmiṣṭhā, who counted as Devayāni's hand-maid. When the fact of other sons by Śarmiṣṭha was discovered, Yayāti was cursed to premature old age unless one of his sons would agree to exchange the father's senility for his own youth. The sons were asked in turn to sacrifice their youth, but the first four refused and were cursed by the irate father (Mbh. 1.79). The youngest, Pūru, agreed willingly and was named heir by the gratified monarch. The immediate moral of this story for the epic was that a junior could rightfully supersede his elder brothers to occupy the throne, whence it was not against law and tradition for the Pāṇḍavas to supersede the elder Kaurava branch. The Ṛgveda knows of a sacrificer Yayāti (RV. 1.31.17), son of Nahuṣa (RV. 10.63.1), but never relates him to any of The Five.

The same epic presents yet another version of the Yayāti story in the *Gālavacaritam* section (Mbh. 5.104-121). Here king Yayāti had only two sons, Yadu and Pūru, in addition to a daughter Mādhavī. This girl was sent out to three separate kings and to Viśvāmitra, in turn, for an agreed bride-price of 200 white horses (with one black ear) in the first three cases and as the equivalent for Viśvāmitra. The sons thus begotten belonged each to his own father. When Yayāti fell from heaven because of his pride, his quite earthly body tumbled precisely on the sacrifical ground where the four brothers had assembled for a *yajña*, along with Yadu, Pūru and Mādhavī herself. By an "Act of Truth," each gave a portion of his own merit to Yayāti, which raised him back to heaven. There is no mention of a curse or the succession here, nor of Anu, Druhyu, Turvaśa-Turvasu.. However, the five sons of Yayāti reappear in Mbh. 5.147.3-13, though only the eldest Yadu and the youngest Pūru are named. Yadu was overbearing because of his prowess. The three brothers next in order supported him. Their disgusted father obtracised them from the kingdom. The verb form is (*rājyāc ca*) *vyaparopayat*, but it seems to me that the correct reading should have been *vyaparodhayat*, seeing the position of the *aparuddha* prince or oligarch (*rājanya*) in *Brāhmaṇa* literature and in the *Arthaśāstra*. In any case, Pūru succeeded to the kingdom; this is briefly confirmed without the rest of the story by Mbh. 12.29. 90-91 and without mention of the other four brothers by Mbh. 12.160.73.

It remains for us to see if anything of value can be extracted from this decidedly mixed bag.

5. It has already been shown that very little emerges from the usual approach of philosophical guesswork followed by pure rationalization. Neither the relevant archaeological discoveries nor the verifiable records with which the results of properly conducted excavations must be collated exist; neither are likely to appear in the forseeable future. To get any logically consistent result under these circumstances, it would be necessary to pay special attention to changes in the social background and to the peculiar mechanism of transmission. Between the redaction of the Vedas and that of the epic intervenes a complete metamorphosis. A predominantly pastoral, tribal society of bronze-age marauders settled down to agrarian peasant life made possible by the discovery and availability of iron. The iron age led also to a change in the center of gravity because the Gangetic plain was first cleared for plough-farming only when cheap metals were found.

Taking these factors into account, one may reason as follows.

i. When we speak of the extinction of a tribe

This content downloaded from 91.229.229.96 on Thu, 12 Jun 2014 13:46:44 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

like the Pūrus, it surely does not mean that every member of the tribe died, but rather that the tribe vanished as an entity. The tribesmen dissolved into a wider peasantry. It is precisely where agriculture was most difficult that tribal cohesion remained necessary; only there could vedic survivals be expected. The best known example is of the Pakthas of RV. 7.18.7, to be identified Πάχτυες of Herodotos (Bk. 3.102; 4.44; 7.67; 68, 85), the modern Pakhtoon or Paṭhāns of Pākistān and Afghānistān. The Pūru army may have been wiped out altogether by Alexander and the Maurya-ans, but the greater number of Pūrus must have survived, it was the most numerous of the tribes then in the Panjāb. Is it too fanciful to trace the modern Panjābi surname Pūrī to the Pūru tribe? There are other survivals of even greater age, *e. g.* the Hariyūpīyā of RV. 6.27.5, which must be modern Harappā. Hariānā and the Mālwā tract of the Panjāb derive from Aryan and Mālava tribal antiquity. The Johiyas are presumably descended from the Yaudheyas. Unfortunately, local tradition is not available in a province trampled underfoot throughout recorded history by so many invading armies; one must look elsewhere for data. However, it is clear that there is no need to find some other tribes into which the Pūrus or the remaining members of the Five merged.

ii. The tribes dissolved into a class society: society which could be divided into Brahmin, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra. Not every Aryan tribe had brahmins within its fold in the vedic stage, nor any strong class division except perhaps between the tribesmen proper and śudra helots. Tribal legends, therefore, had to be transmitted after the dissolution through the literate fraction, the brahmins. While the brahmins left a clear mark upon Sanskrit literature, Vedic and later tribal life also left its reciprocal mark upon the brahmins. One has only to consult any standard *gotra* list[6] to be convinced of this. Kutsa is a seer and tribal name in the Ṛgveda; RV. 7.25.5 implies that some Vasiṣṭhas were Kutsas. Today, they rank among the Kevala-Aṅgirasas, with Kautsa. The Ṛgvedic Purukutsa, who headed a combined tribe according to his name, reappears in the Viṣṇuvṛddha *Pravara*, though not a brahmin in the Ṛgveda. It is obvious that the later rule, "a kṣatriya has his priest's *gotra*," has been inverted from the original situation, where the sacrificer and the warrior necessarily belonged to the same clan and might be brothers. Even some modern brahmins have acquired surnames from the non-brahmin families for whom they officiated, *e. g.* Āṃgre, Marāṭhe. The double Vaikarṇa tribe of RV. 7.8.11 is the only possible source for Vaikarṇa, Vaikarṇeya, Vaikarṇāyana, Vaikarṇi in the *gotra* list, albeit in several different groups. Not all such tribes appear in the *gotra* rolls now left, *e. g.* the Śigru of RV. 7.8.19 which left a *gotra* that appears in a Mathurā inscription.[7] I have concentrated upon the Ten-Kings hymn because of one most striking name: Bhṛgu (RV. 7.18.6). Today, the Bhṛguids are known only as a major brahmin clan-group. RV. 7.18 has therefore been interpreted to mean that one priest loyally followed his royal patron into battle—a suggestion too ridiculous to be considered. The Bhṛgus made an excellent chariot for Indra (RV. 4.16.20), while Bhārgava still retains the secondary meaning "potter." The second book of the Ṛgveda belongs to the Gṛtsamadas, later ascribed to the Jamadagni group of the Bhṛgus. Bhṛgu himself is not a Ṛgvedic seer at all, in spite of his later pre-eminence.

The pre-eminence was due to one special aptitude the Bhārgavas seem to have mastered before the rest of the brahmins, except possibly the Kāśyapas. They absorbed and rewrote local tradition, assimilating it to ancient vedic stories whenever possible. The extinction of the tribes and brahmin monopoly of vedic *sūktas* made this possible. The *Mahābhārata* inflation is peculiarly to the credit or the discredit of the Bhṛgus.[8] Naturally, they wrote themselves up as well. Bhṛgu becomes a special *vibhūti* of Kṛṣṇa in *Gīta* (Mbh. 6.32.25). The greatest of martial heroes—in brahmin records—was their ancestor Paraśurāma, who annihilated all kṣatriyas no less than twenty-one times, overcompensating the only known Bhṛgu military experience: defeat in the Ten-Kings battle. The name Bhṛgu is related to Phrygian, but the tribe had no existence in post-vedic India. This made it all the easier for such

[6] J. Brough: *The Early Brahmanical System Of Gotra & Pravara* (The *Gotra-Pravaramañjarī of Puruṣottama*, translated); Cambridge University Press, 1953.

[7] H. Lüders: List of Brāhmī inscriptions from the earliest times to about A. D. 400 with the exception of those of Asoka; *Epigraphia Indica*, Appendix to vol. 10; no. 82.

[8] V. S. Sukṭhaṇkar: *The Bhṛgus and the Bhārata: A Text-Historical Study*; Sukṭhaṇkar Memorial Edition, vol. I, 278-337; reprinted from the *Annals of the Bhandarkar O. R. Institute*, vol. 18, pp. 1-76, being the *Epic Studies VI.*

This content downloaded from 91.229.229.96 on Thu, 12 Jun 2014 13:46:44 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of them to climb fast as had joined the brahmin fold and learned the trick of rewriting.

iii. It follows that we need not expect too much accuracy from what is left of brahmin tradition, but also that the tradition is not entirely worthless. It is essential to remove what is specifically written into document to glorify the writer's clan, or to absorb a local story of interest to some offshoot of the clan. I may point in passing to the Matsyagandha *gotra* among the Bhṛgus and the Bhāratan story of Satyavatī-Matsyagandhā (Mbh. 1.57.36 *ff.*), again connected through the heroine's brother with the Matsya tribe of RV. 7.18. The extra-ordinary tale of the demon Jālaṃdhara, apparently the tutelary *Yakṣa* of the Panjāb district, could hardly have entered the Purāṇas[9] without some connection with the *gotra* Jālaṃdhari among the Kaśyapas.

For our special problem, there seems to be just one source left, namely the curse of Yayāti. It is quite obvious that the epic version was due to the natural desire to arrange antique lore into a linear sequence of great kings Nahuṣa-Yayāti-Pūru. The ascription of five sons with the Ṛgvedic Five tribal names to a single "king" Yayāti was possible only because all the tribes concerned were far distant in time and place. This would account for the discrepancies noted earlier. The rewriting was done from many conflicting or divergent sources. Nor have we purely Aryan tradition, for the main purpose of the redaction was to assimilate Nāga and other un-Aryan stories as well. A relatively minor Ṛgvedic characters like Ikṣvāku had become great in eastern genealogies, the Okkāka from whom Pasenadi of Kosala and the Śakyans both claimed descent according to Pāli sources. Ikṣvāku is mentioned only once in the oldest Veda (RV. 10.60.4) and given lower status to the Marāyin who towered above him and above the Five Tribes. Marāyin disappears from sight after this single mention.

Yayāti cursed his obdurate sons as follows (Mbh. 1.79.7, 11-13, 19, 22-3). For Yadu: "Thy descendants will never share in kingship." The Yadus known to the writer's sources were clearly an anarchic tribe with quite limited power for the chief, as contrasted to the absolute monarchy which was all that kingship signified to the redactors. This is amply confirmed by puranic reports of the Yadus; even in the epic, the Yadus have no king. The next son Turvasu was told: "Thy descendants will go to perdition. Thou shalt be king over people who do not observe caste rules, who marry against the caste order, follow beastly (totemic?) rites, lead sinful lives, lie with the wives of their betters and are un-Aryan barbarians." The Turvaśas clearly dropped out of the main course of brahminical development, as did other frontier people like the Madras and Bāhlīkas. The execration of Druhyu runs: "Thou shalt go to a place with thy following, where the sole means of transport is by rafts; nonking, a mere chieftain (*bhoja*) by title." My interpretation of *bhoja* can be supported by other references and arguments. The fourth son, Anu, was damned with: "Thou and thy descendants shall die prematurely; no right shalt thou have to perform the correct fire-ritual." These detailed and specific curses bear the mark of historical truth.

The answer to the original question is now simple. The four "accursed sons" (of Yayāti) among the Five Tribes never reached inner differentiation into a class society, nor patronised brahmin rites. They inhabited places well out of the way and soon ceased to be counted among the high Aryans when Yajurvedic ritual developed its monstrous sacrifices and was in turn superseded by the agricultural life. That the Five do not appear as individual tribes nor as an ethnic grouping in the Yajurveda and the *Brāhmaṇas* indicates that they left a faint impression on those who handed down the tradition. The eastward shift in territory after the Ṛgveda and the dominance of the brahmin priesthood as a separate caste over the line of transmission cannot be contested. But the Yadus had to be revived in some way as they were Kṛṣṇa's people, though Greek accounts ignore the extinct Yadus to tell us that the Kṛṣṇa-Herakles cult was centred at Mathurā of the Śūrasenas. The later, fictitious Yādavas or Jādhavs, could safely be foisted upon a vanished tribe. The original Yadu demi-god or hero had stood out against cattle-sacrifice to Indra; his cult accordingly spread into

[9] *Padmapurāṇa* (*uttarakhaṇḍa*) 6.3-19 and again in 6.98-107, though no critical edition of the *purāṇa* is available, and the two versions even in a single section show considerable differences of detail. The legend or rather myth appears also in *Skanda-P.* 2.4.14-22, again without a critical text. A Jalandara appears among the 84 *siddhas* and in the line of the *Nātha-panthīya* teachers.

This content downloaded from 91.229.229.96 on Thu, 12 Jun 2014 13:46:44 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

a newly agrarian Panjāb,[10] driving that of Indra to the hills before 327 B.C. He had a definite popular following, so was promoted to be Arjuna's charioteer though his original saga never rose above the ox-cart. The Pūrus, and only the Pūrus among the Five Tribes, outlasted the others. Their memory was fresher because they had colonised extensively, a junior Kuru branch going as far as the Yamunā and Ganges rivers to the east. Only this Kuru branch, not the Pūrus proper, left a mark upon our current gotra list: the gentes Kauravya, Kauravyāyaṇa, Kaurukṣetri. However the Pūrus had developed kingship, had patronised brahmins and the sacrifice. Even though Alexander made no impression upon Indian tradition, some memory of one or more fighting Pūru kings necessarily survived. The "Great Charioteer" Paurava had therefore to be made to join in the "great war" which had originally been a small though desperate skirmish in Kuru-land. This seems to me to account for all the divergent features of the epic tradition, besides explaining what became of the Five Tribes.

[10] This follows from section 8 of Arrian's *Indika*, equating Kṛṣṇa to Herakles and Indra to his Dionysos (not Śiva as is often done).

FRAGMENTS FROM THREE LOST KOŚAS: VYĀḌI'S UTPALINĪ II.

ROBERT BIRWÉ
UNIVERSITY OF COLOGNE, GERMANY

1. In the first paper of this series, entitled Vācaspati's Śabdārṇava,[1] I have shown that the Utpalinī is the work of Vyāḍi.[2] Against this opinion one could object that Sarvānanda[3] and, following him, Rāyamukṭa[4] seem to suggest a different author for this *kośa*, because they distinguish between the Utpalinī as a *nāmamātratantra*, a work dealing only with words, and Vyāḍi's work as a *liṅgamātratantra*, a work dealing only with genders. This objection is, in the view of R. Śarmā,[5] not valid. For he says: "The distinction, however, is real, for Vyāḍi must have written both a regular *koṣa*, quoted by Sarvānanda himself, and a *liṅgānuśāsana*, known also to Harṣavardhana[5a] and Vāmana."[5b]

2. R. Śarmā's statement that "Vyāḍi must have written both a regular *koṣa* ... and a *liṅgānuśāsana* ..." is unquestionably too assertive. One could agree to it if the following two questions could be answered in the positive:

1. Has one Vyāḍi written a *liṅgānuśāsana*?
2. If this is the case, is the author of the *liṅgānuśāsana* to be identified with the author of the Utpalinī?

As regards the first question, no manuscript of Vyāḍi's *liṅgānuśāsana* has as yet been discovered. This, however, is no argument for the view that it never existed. For a complete loss of the manuscripts of a work is nothing unusual in India. Three quotations under the name of Vyāḍi are

[1] *JAOS* 85.4. (1965), p. 524-543.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 524 ff.

[3] He says on Amarakośa (= AK) I.1.2: *anyatantrāṇi vyāḍivararuciprabhṛtīnāṃ tantrāṇi samāhṛtya ekīkṛtya ... trikāṇḍotpalinyādīni nāmamātratantrāṇi, vyāḍivararucyādipraṇītāni tu liṅgamātratantrāṇi.*

[4] He says on AK I.1.2.: *anyeṣāṃ vyāḍivararucikātyāyanādīnāṃ nāmānuśāsanāni liṅgānuśasanāni ca tantrāṇi samāhṛtya ... trikāṇḍotpalinyādīni nāmamātratantrāṇi, vyāḍivararucyādipraṇītāni liṅgamātratantrāṇi.* Cf. also Bhānujīdīkṣita on AK I.1.2: *trikāṇḍotpalinyādīni nāmamātrapratipādakāni, vararucyādikṛtāni tu liṅgamātrapratipādakāni.*—I do not agree with Sarvānanda and Rāyamukuṭa that Vyāḍi is anterior to the Amarakośa. Cf. below p. 42, § 6.

[5] *Kalpadrukośa of Keśava*, vol. I, Gaekwad's Oriental Series (= *GOS*) no. 42, Baroda 1928, Introduction p. xii.

[5a] R. Śarmā refers, *op. cit.*, p. xii, note 2, to R. O. Franke, *Die Indischen Genuslehren mit dem Text der Liṅgânuçâsana's des Çâkaṭâyana, Harṣavardhana, Vararuci*, ..., Kiel 1890, p. 119, verse 96.

[5b] R. Śarmā refers, *op. cit.*, p. xii, note 3, to "*Liṅgānuṣāsana* (sic!), [ed .by C. D. Dalal,] GOS [no. 6, Baroda 1918], p. 2, l. 18."

This content downloaded from 91.229.229.96 on Thu, 12 Jun 2014 13:46:44 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions